arXiv:1701.05415v1 [gr-qc] 19 Jan 2017

Static and spherically symmetric solutions in a scenario with quadratic curvature contribution

F. A. Silveira[1,2*] **R. F. Sobreiro**[1†] **A. A. Tomaz**[1,3‡]

[1] *UFF – Universidade Federal Fluminense,*
Instituto de Física, Campus da Praia Vermelha,
Avenida General Milton Tavares de Souza s/n, 24210-346,
Niterói, RJ, Brazil.

[2] *UERJ - Universidade Estadual do Rio de Janeiro, Departamento de Física Teórica,*
Rua São Francisco Xavier 524, 20550-013, Maracanã,
Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brasil.

[3] *CBPF – Centro Brasileiro de Pesquisas Físicas,*
Rua Dr. Xavier Sigaud, 150 , Urca, 22290-180
Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil

Abstract

In this work we investigate analytic static and spherically symmetric solutions of a generalized theory of gravity in the Einstein-Cartan formalism. The main goal consists in analyzing the behavior of the solutions under the influence of a quadratic curvature term in the presence of cosmological constant and no torsion. In the first incursion we found an exact de Sitter-like solution. This solution is obtained by imposing vanishing torsion in the field equations. On the other hand, by imposing vanishing torsion directly in the action, we are able to find a perturbative solution around the Schwarzschild-de Sitter usual solution. We briefly discuss classical singularities for each solution and the event horizons. A primer discussion on the thermodynamics of the geometrical solutions is also addressed.

1 Introduction

In the present work we consider a generalization of general relativity (GR) [1] with cosmological constant in the Einstein-Cartan (EC) formalism [2, 3, 4, 5], *i.e.*, where the fundamental variables are the vierbein and the spin-connection instead the metric tensor and the affine-connection as in the Palatini formalism [6, 7]. In this generalization, the usual Einstein-Hilbert action [8] is supplemented by a quadratic curvature term and a quadratic torsion term.

*fernanda.alvarim@gmail.com
†sobreiro@if.uff.br
‡tomaz@if.uff.br

Specifically, we study vacuum static and spherically symmetric solutions of this model by considering the case of vanishing torsion. Because we are considering the EC formalism, the action provides two field equations, one for the vierbein and another for the spin-connection. First, we show that a de Sitter spacetime is an exact vacuum solution of these equations. This is a non-trivial result since the system of equations is over-determined for vanishing torsion. After that, we obtain a perturbative solution around the Schwarzschild-de Sitter solution by neglecting the spin-connection equation, which is equivalent to impose vanishing torsion at the action level. It is important to be clear that, to obtain such solution, the curvature squared term is treated as perturbation around the usual Einstein term with cosmological constant. Hence, it the the generalized Einstein equation which is perturbed instead a perturbed solution around a fixed background.

Static and spherically symmetric solutions in alternative gravity models is a recurrent subject of investigation [9, 10, 11, 12]. In particular, K. Stelle investigated this subject in a quite general higher derivative scenario in the metric formalism [9]. Hence, Stelle's work encompasses the contributions of quadratic curvature terms. Nevertheless, we call attention to the main differences between [9] and the present paper: First, our work is performed in the EC formalism instead of the metric formalism. Second, as already explained, our perturbed solution is a deformation around the Schwarzschild-de Sitter spacetime obtained by considering the quadratic curvature term as a perturbation while Stelle's result is a perturbed solution around the Minkowski background obtained by imposing a perturbation on the solution.

It is worth mentioning that, although our main motivation is the action originated as an emergent gravity in a quantum gauge theory scenario [13, 14, 15, 16], our analysis and discussions are general enough to encode any gravity theory as above described. Nevertheless, we will refer to the model [13, 14, 15, 16] whenever we find it elucidative. Perhaps, the most important general motivation would be the recent detection of gravitational waves by the *Laser Interferometer Gravitational-wave Observatory* (LIGO) collaboration [17]. Such discover brings a new era on black hole physics as well as the possibility to test alternative solutions derived of modified theories of gravity that should expand the horizons of the well-known Einstein's gravitational theory.

This work is organized as follows: In Sec. 2 we define the model and the respective field equations and specify them for static and spherically symmetric variables. The exact solution is discussed in Sect. 3. In Sec. 4 we provide the perturbative solution. In Sect. 5, a the thermodynamical aspects of the solutions are briefly discussed. Finally, our final considerations are displayed in Sect. 6.

2 Action and field equations

Let us consider the following gravity action,

$$S_{\rm grav}=\frac{1}{16\pi G}\int\left(\frac{3}{2\Lambda^2}R^{\mathfrak{a}}{}_{\mathfrak{b}}\star R_{\mathfrak{a}}{}^{\mathfrak{b}}+T^{\mathfrak{a}}\star T_{\mathfrak{a}}-\frac{\epsilon}{2}\varepsilon_{\mathfrak{abcd}}R^{\mathfrak{ab}}e^{\mathfrak{c}}e^{\mathfrak{d}}+\frac{\tilde{\Lambda}^2}{12}\varepsilon_{\mathfrak{abcd}}e^{\mathfrak{a}}e^{\mathfrak{b}}e^{\mathfrak{c}}e^{\mathfrak{d}}\right)\,. \tag{2.1}$$

where $R^{\mathfrak{a}}{}_{\mathfrak{b}}=d\omega^{\mathfrak{a}}{}_{\mathfrak{b}}+\omega^{\mathfrak{a}}{}_{\mathfrak{c}}\omega^{\mathfrak{c}}{}_{\mathfrak{b}}$ is the curvature 2-form, $T^{\mathfrak{a}}=de^{\mathfrak{a}}+\omega^{\mathfrak{a}}{}_{\mathfrak{b}}e^{\mathfrak{b}}$ is the torsion 2-form, $\omega^{\mathfrak{a}}{}_{\mathfrak{b}}$ is the spin connection 1-form, and $e^{\mathfrak{a}}$ is the vierbein 1-form. Moreover, $\star$ stands for the Hodge dual operator, G is the Newton constant, $\widetilde{\Lambda}$ is the cosmological constant, and Λ is a mass parameter. The corresponding vacuum field equations are easily obtained. For the vierbein, we get

$$\frac{3}{2\Lambda^2}R^{\mathfrak{bc}}\star(R_{\mathfrak{bc}}e_{\mathfrak{a}})+T^{\mathfrak{b}}\star(T_{\mathfrak{b}}e_{\mathfrak{a}})+\mathrm{D}\star T_{\mathfrak{a}}-\varepsilon_{\mathfrak{abcd}}\left(R^{\mathfrak{bc}}e^{\mathfrak{d}}-\frac{\tilde{\Lambda}^2}{3}e^{\mathfrak{b}}e^{\mathfrak{c}}e^{\mathfrak{d}}\right)=0\,, \tag{2.2}$$

while for the spin connection, we obtain,

$$\frac{3}{\Lambda^2} D \star R_{\mathfrak{ab}} + e_{\mathfrak{b}} \star T_{\mathfrak{a}} - e_{\mathfrak{a}} \star T_{\mathfrak{b}} - \varepsilon_{\mathfrak{abcd}} T^{\mathfrak{c}} e^{\mathfrak{d}} = 0 \ . \tag{2.3}$$

Eqs. (2.2) and Eq. (2.3) are coupled nonlinear differential equations and thus, highly difficult to solve without any special insight. For this reason, we proceed with the simplest case where torsion is set to vanish. Hence, Eqs. (2.2) and Eq. (2.3) reduce to[1]

$$\frac{3}{2\Lambda^2} R^{\mathfrak{bc}} \star (R_{\mathfrak{bc}} e_{\mathfrak{a}}) - \varepsilon_{\mathfrak{abcd}} \left(R^{\mathfrak{bc}} e^{\mathfrak{d}} - \frac{\tilde{\Lambda}^2}{3} e^{\mathfrak{b}} e^{\mathfrak{c}} e^{\mathfrak{d}} \right) = 0 \ , \tag{2.4}$$

$$\frac{3}{\Lambda^2} D \star R_{\mathfrak{ab}} = 0 \ . \tag{2.5}$$

Our aim is to solve equations (2.4) and (2.5) for static and spherically symmetric conditions. To do so, we will consider two different situations:

- First, we consider both equations (2.4) and (2.5) and find an exact solution, corresponding to a strong influence of the quadratic curvature term. The result we find is the usual de Sitter solution with an effective cosmological constant given by a mix between Λ and $\widetilde{\Lambda}$.
- Second, by taking Λ as a huge quantity[2] when compared to the quadratic curvature term, we treat this term as a perturbation. The perturbed solution is a deformation of the usual Schwarzschild-de Sitter solution. To obtain such solution, the equation (2.5) is neglect because it is a pure perturbation in Λ^{-2}. This situation is equivalent to set $T = 0$ at the action (2.1) before the computation of the field equations.

Eqs. (2.4) and (2.5), in Schwarzschild coordinates,

$$e^0 = e^{\alpha(r)} \mathrm{d}t \quad , \quad e^1 = e^{\beta(r)} \mathrm{d}r \quad , \quad e^2 = r \mathrm{d}\theta \quad , \quad e^3 = r \sin\theta \mathrm{d}\phi \ , \tag{2.6}$$

can be recasted as

$$\sigma \left[2 \left(\frac{e^{-2\beta} \partial_r \beta}{r} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{1 - e^{-2\beta}}{r^2} \right)^2 \right] + 2 \left(\frac{e^{-2\beta} \partial_r \beta}{r} \right) + \frac{1 - e^{-2\beta}}{r^2} + 3\lambda = 0 \ , \tag{2.7}$$

$$\sigma \left[2 \left(\frac{e^{-2\beta} \partial_r \alpha}{r} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{1 - e^{-2\beta}}{r^2} \right)^2 \right] - 2 \left(\frac{e^{-2\beta} \partial_r \alpha}{r} \right) + \frac{1 - e^{-2\beta}}{r^2} + 3\lambda = 0 \ , \tag{2.8}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\sigma \left\{ \left[e^{-(\alpha+\beta)} \partial_r \left(e^{-\beta} \partial_r e^{\alpha} \right) \right]^2 + \left(\frac{e^{-2\beta} \partial_r \alpha}{r} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{e^{-2\beta} \partial_r \beta}{r} \right)^2 \right\} + \\ &- e^{-(\alpha+\beta)} \partial_r \left(e^{-\beta} \partial_r e^{\alpha} \right) - \frac{e^{-2\beta} \partial_r \alpha}{r} + \frac{e^{-2\beta} \partial_r \beta}{r} + 3\lambda = 0 \ , \end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

[1] It is worth mentioning that the action (2.1) describes an emergent gravity associated to an $SO(5)$ Yang-Mills theory [13]. However, the field equations (2.4) and (2.5) are general enough to describe any gravity theory with a Riemann squared curvature in the action. Whenever is relevant, we will comment about the model developed in [13] and the results here found.

[2] This situation is consistent with the results of [18, 16] where 1- and 2-loop explicit computations predict a huge value for Λ in the effective gravity model constructed in [13].

$$\partial_r \mathcal{R} = 0 \ , \tag{2.10}$$

for $\mathfrak{a} = 0$, $\mathfrak{a} = 1$ and $\mathfrak{a} = 2$, respectively. In Eq. (2.10), $\mathcal{R}$ stands for the scalar curvature. We notice that differential equations obtained for $\mathfrak{a} = 2$ and $\mathfrak{a} = 3$ are identical. The constants in Eqs. (2.7), (2.8) and (2.9) are $\sigma \equiv -3/(2\Lambda^2)$ and $\lambda \equiv -\tilde{\Lambda}^2/3$. The combination of Eqs. (2.7) and (2.8) leads to the following constraint

$$\partial_r \left[\alpha(r) + \beta(r)\right] \left\{\partial_r \left[\beta(r) - \alpha(r)\right] + \frac{r}{\sigma} e^{2\beta(r)}\right\} = 0 \ , \tag{2.11}$$

which allows two possibilities:

- $\partial_r \left(\alpha(r) + \beta(r)\right) = 0 \Rightarrow \alpha(r) + \beta(r) = f(t)$ - Thus, we have freedom to re-scale the time coordinate with simply $f(t) = 0$.
- $\partial_r \beta(r) + \partial_r \alpha(r) + \sigma^{-1} r \exp(2\beta(r)) = 0$ - This condition is unusual and quite complicated since it is a coupled non-linear differential equation for $\alpha(r)$ and β.

We will stick to the first possibility, which is the usual relation in General Relativity and impose $\alpha(r) = -\beta(r)$.

3 Exact solution

In order to solve analytically the system of equations (2.7)-(2.10), we start by subtracting Eq. (2.8) from Eq. (2.9), obtaining[3],

$$\left(\frac{\ddot{h}}{2} + \frac{1-h}{r^2}\right)\left[\sigma\left(\frac{\ddot{h}}{2} - \frac{1-h}{r^2}\right) - 1\right] = 0 \ , \tag{3.1}$$

where, the condition $\alpha + \beta = 0$ was employed. Moreover, we have defined $e^{-2\beta(r)} \equiv h$ and $\dot{h} \equiv dh/dr$. Eq. (3.1) can be decomposed in two independent differential equations where only one must be zero. First, we have

$$r^2 \ddot{h} + 2h - 2\left(1 + \frac{r^2}{\sigma}\right) = 0 \ , \tag{3.2}$$

whose solution is

$$h(r) = 1 + \frac{r^2}{2\sigma} + \sqrt{r}\left[c_1 \cos\left(\frac{\sqrt{7}}{2}\ln r\right) + c_2 \sin\left(\frac{\sqrt{7}}{2}\ln r\right)\right] \ , \tag{3.3}$$

where c_1 and c_2 are integration constants. It turns out that this solution does not satisfy the whole differential equation system (2.7)-(2.10).

The second possibility is

$$r^2 \ddot{h} - 2h + 2 = 0 \ , \tag{3.4}$$

whose solution is given by

$$h(r) = 1 + c_3 r^2 + \frac{c_4}{r} \ , \tag{3.5}$$

[3]The partial derivatives were changed to ordinary ones, since β is only r-dependent.

where c_3 and c_4 are integration constants. It is a straightforward computation to show that we must have $c_4 = 0$ and $c_3 \neq 0$ in order to the solution (3.5) satisfy the system (2.7)-(2.10). Moreover, there are two possible values for the constant c_3, namely Υ_p and Υ_m,

$$\begin{aligned} \Upsilon_p &= \frac{\Lambda^2}{3}\left[1+\sqrt{1-2\frac{\tilde{\Lambda}^2}{\Lambda^2}}\right] , \\ \Upsilon_m &= \frac{\Lambda^2}{3}\left[1-\sqrt{1-2\frac{\tilde{\Lambda}^2}{\Lambda^2}}\right] . \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-2\beta_p} &= 1-\Upsilon_p r^2 , \\ e^{-2\beta_m} &= 1-\Upsilon_m r^2 . \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

The solutions (3.7) satisfy the system of differential equations (2.7)-(2.10), simultaneously. This is an important and necessary verification since this system of equations is over-determined. From (3.6), it is clear that $\tilde{\Lambda}^2$ cannot exceed $\Lambda^2/2$, otherwise, the solution founded is inconsistent. Moreover, if $2\tilde{\Lambda}^2 = \Lambda^2$, only one solution is allowed $\Upsilon_m = \Upsilon_p$.

Now, if we assume that Λ^2 has a large value and $\tilde{\Lambda}^2$ has a small value[4], we can expand (3.6) to find

$$\begin{aligned} \Upsilon_s &\approx \frac{1}{3}\tilde{\Lambda}^2 , \\ \Upsilon_b &\approx \frac{2}{3}\Lambda^2 . \end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

The first case, Υ_s has a narrow value if we take $\widetilde{\Lambda}$ as its observational value. On the other hand, the second case stems for a de Sitter-like space with a very small radius, since Λ^2 is very big. Hence, we have a weak curvature regime for Υ_s and a strong one for Υ_b.

Obviously, all usual properties of de Sitter spacetime are maintained[5].

[4] This is consistent, for instance, with the explicit values $\Lambda^2 \approx 7.665\times 10^{31}\mathrm{TeV}^2 \gg \tilde{\Lambda}^2 \approx 1.000\times 10^{-92}\mathrm{TeV}^2$ found in [18, 16].

[5] An alternaltive and simple way to find the solution (3.7) is to directly deal with equation (2.2) in form notation and try an *ansatz* solution of the form

$$R^{\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b}} = \zeta e^{\mathfrak{a}} e^{\mathfrak{b}} , \tag{3.9}$$

where ζ is a constant mass parameter. The solution (3.9) is a natural choice since we have the usual cosmological constant term in (2.2). The direct substitution of (3.9) in (2.2) leads to the characteristic equation for ζ,

$$\frac{3}{2\Lambda^2}\zeta^2 - \zeta + \frac{\tilde{\Lambda}^2}{3} = 0 , \tag{3.10}$$

providing $\zeta = \Upsilon_{p,m}$. Hence, solution (3.9) is an alternative covariant form of the curvature associated with solution (3.7).

4 Perturbative solution

From this point, we consider the quadratic curvature to be a small perturbation in Eq. (2.7). For that, we multiply Eq. (2.7) by λ, then

$$\eta\left[2\left(\frac{e^{-2\beta}\partial_r\beta}{r}\right)^2+\left(\frac{1-e^{-2\beta}}{r^2}\right)^2\right]+\lambda\left[2\left(\frac{e^{-2\beta}\partial_r\beta}{r}\right)+\frac{1-e^{-2\beta}}{r^2}+3\lambda\right]=0\ . \tag{4.1}$$

In this form, Eq. (4.1) can be solved analytically through the employment of perturbation theory if $\eta\equiv\sigma\lambda\equiv\tilde{\Lambda}^2/2\Lambda^2$ is a very small dimensionless parameter. Hence, the quadratic term can be treated as a perturbation around the term proportional to λ. It is evident that the term proportional to λ is the usual Einstein equation with cosmological constant $\widetilde{\Lambda}$. For simplicity, let $u(r)=1-e^{-2\beta}$ and take all derivatives as ordinary ones. So, we rewrite Eq. (4.1) as

$$\eta\left[\frac{1}{2}\dot{u}^2+\left(\frac{u}{r^2}\right)^2\right]+\lambda\left(r\dot{u}+u+3\lambda r^2\right)=0\ . \tag{4.2}$$

A perturbative solution of Eq. (4.2) has the general form

$$u(r)=u_0(r)+\eta u_1(r)+\eta^2u_2(r)+\eta^3u_3(r)+\cdots\ . \tag{4.3}$$

Substituting (4.3) in the Eq. (4.2), and split order by order in η, we find an infinite set of descent coupled equations

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dr}(ru_0)+3\lambda r^2 &= 0\ ,\\
\frac{d}{dr}(ru_1)+\frac{1}{2\lambda}\left(\frac{du_0}{dr}\right)^2+\frac{u_0^2}{\lambda r^2} &= 0\ ,\\
\frac{d}{dr}(ru_2)+\frac{1}{\lambda}\left(\frac{du_0}{dr}\frac{du_1}{dr}\right)+\frac{2u_0u_1}{\lambda r^2} &= 0\ ,\\
\frac{d}{dr}(ru_3)+\frac{1}{2\lambda}\left(\frac{du_1}{dr}\right)^2+\frac{u_1^2}{\lambda r^2}+\frac{1}{\lambda}\left(\frac{du_0}{dr}\frac{du_2}{dr}\right)+\frac{2u_0u_2}{\lambda r^2} &= 0\ ,\\
\frac{d}{dr}(ru_4)+\frac{1}{\lambda}\left(\frac{du_0}{dr}\frac{du_3}{dr}\right)+\frac{2u_0u_3}{\lambda r^2}+\frac{1}{\lambda}\left(\frac{du_1}{dr}\frac{du_2}{dr}\right)+\frac{2u_1u_2}{\lambda r^2} &= 0\ ,\\
&\vdots\quad .
\end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

With such hierarchy of equations (4.4), we can solve, iteratively, all the equations above. Starting with the zeroth order, we obtain

$$u_0=\frac{\tilde{\Lambda}^2}{3}r^2+\frac{2GM}{r}\ , \tag{4.5}$$

which is the usual Schwarzschild-de Sitter solution [19, 20, 21], obviously, since this is the situation for $\eta=0$. Hence, the integration constant at the $1/r$ term is obtained from the Newtonian limit. Solving iteratively the rest of the equations (4.4), we find the following solution (at fourth order),

$$\begin{aligned}
e^{-2\beta} &\approx 1-\frac{2GM}{r}-\frac{\tilde{\Lambda}^2}{3}r^2-\eta\left(\frac{\mathcal{C}_{12}}{r}+\mathcal{C}_{11}r^2+\frac{\mathcal{C}_{13}}{r^4}\right)-\eta^2\left(\frac{\mathcal{C}_{22}}{r}+\mathcal{C}_{21}r^2+\frac{\mathcal{C}_{23}}{r^4}+\frac{\mathcal{C}_{24}}{r^7}\right)\\
&- \eta^3\left(\frac{\mathcal{C}_{32}}{r}+\mathcal{C}_{31}r^2+\frac{\mathcal{C}_{32}}{r^4}+\frac{\mathcal{C}_{34}}{r^7}+\frac{\mathcal{C}_{35}}{r^{10}}\right)-\eta^4\left(\frac{\mathcal{C}_{42}}{r}+\mathcal{C}_{41}r^2+\frac{\mathcal{C}_{43}}{r^4}+\frac{\mathcal{C}_{44}}{r^7}+\frac{\mathcal{C}_{45}}{r^{10}}+\frac{\mathcal{C}_{46}}{r^{13}}\right)+\ldots
\end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

where the constants $C_{k\ell}$ can be arranged as[6]

$$\mathcal{C}_{k\ell} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\tilde{\Lambda}^2}{3} & 2GM & & & & \\ \frac{\tilde{\Lambda}^2}{3} & \mathcal{C}_{12} & \frac{6G^2M^2}{\tilde{\Lambda}^2} & & & \\ 2\frac{\tilde{\Lambda}^2}{3} & \mathcal{C}_{22} & \frac{6GM}{\tilde{\Lambda}^2}\Omega_1 & -\frac{36G^3M^3}{\tilde{\Lambda}^4} & & \\ 5\frac{\tilde{\Lambda}^2}{3} & \mathcal{C}_{32} & \frac{9}{2\tilde{\Lambda}^2}\Omega_2 & \frac{54G^2M^2}{\tilde{\Lambda}^4}\Omega_4 & \frac{312G^4M^4}{\tilde{\Lambda}^6} & \\ 14\frac{\tilde{\Lambda}^2}{3} & C_{42} & -\frac{3}{\tilde{\Lambda}^2}\Omega_3 & \frac{3GM}{\tilde{\Lambda}^2}\Omega_5 & \frac{54G^2M^2}{\tilde{\Lambda}^4}\Omega_6 & -\frac{3564G^5M^5}{\tilde{\Lambda}^8} \end{pmatrix} \tag{4.8}$$

where the index k (line) and ℓ (column) run along the discrete intervals $[0,\infty]$ and $[1,k+2]$, respectively, and

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_1 &= \mathcal{C}_{12} - 2GM \ , \\ \Omega_2 &= \left[\mathcal{C}_{12}^2 + 4GM\left(6GM - 2\mathcal{C}_{12} - \mathcal{C}_{22}\right)\right] \ , \\ \Omega_3 &= \left[\mathcal{C}_{12}\left(\mathcal{C}_{12} + \mathcal{C}_{22} - 12GM\right) - 2GM\left(2\mathcal{C}_{22} + \mathcal{C}_{32} - 20GM\right)\right] \ , \\ \Omega_4 &= \left(8GM - 3\mathcal{C}_{12}\right) \ , \\ \Omega_5 &= \left[3\mathcal{C}_{12}^2 - 2GM\left(12\mathcal{C}_{12} + 3\mathcal{C}_{22} - 24GM\right)\right] \ , \\ \Omega_6 &= 2\left(\mathcal{C}_{12} - 3GM\right) \ . \end{aligned} \tag{4.9}$$

The differential equation Eq. (2.9) can be solved for α once we have β. The result is consistent with the condition $\alpha = -\beta$. Moreover, as discussed before, Eq. (2.10) can be neglected. Simple consistency checks are: the limits $\eta \to 0$ and $\tilde{\Lambda}^2 = 0$, providing a pure Schwarzschild solution; the limits $M = 0$ and $\eta \to 0$ result in a de Sitter spacetime solution; and, as already seen, the limit $\eta \to 0$ provides the Schwarzschild-de Sitter solution.

It is interesting to take the limit $r \gg 2GM$ in the solution (4.6). The result is immediate,

$$e^{-2\beta} \approx \left(1 - \tilde{\Upsilon} r^2\right) \ , \tag{4.10}$$

where

$$\tilde{\Upsilon} \approx \frac{\tilde{\Lambda}^2}{3} + \eta\left(\frac{\tilde{\Lambda}^2}{3}\right) + \eta^2\left(2\frac{\tilde{\Lambda}^2}{3}\right) + \eta^3\left(5\frac{\tilde{\Lambda}^2}{3}\right) + \eta^4\left(14\frac{\tilde{\Lambda}^2}{3}\right) + \dots \ , \tag{4.11}$$

which is a perturbatively asymptotically de Sitter spacetime, as expected. Remarkably, the relation (4.11) can be written as

$$\widetilde{\Upsilon} = \left(\sum_{w=0}^{\infty} \eta^w a_w\right) \frac{\tilde{\Lambda}^2}{3} \ , \tag{4.12}$$

where

$$a_w = \frac{(2w)!}{(w+1)!w!} \tag{4.13}$$

[6]The solution (4.6) can be generalized to all orders in a very concise form given by

$$e^{-2\beta} = 1 - \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \eta^k \sum_{\ell=1}^{k+2} \mathcal{C}_{k\ell} r^{5-3\ell} \ , \tag{4.7}$$

where the general constants $\mathcal{C}_{k\ell}$ depend on the previous order constants. In particular, the $\mathcal{C}_{k2}$, with $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, stand for the actual integration constants.

are the Catalan numbers[7]. Moreover, by setting $\eta = 0$ in (4.11) we find $\tilde{\Upsilon} = \Upsilon_s$. Hence, we have an asymptotic relation between the perturbative solution and the exact one. Further, by expanding the constant Υ_p in (3.6) for small $\widetilde{\Lambda}/\Lambda$, we get the same expression (4.12). Hence, we have consistency between the exact and perturbative solution for small $\widetilde{\Lambda}/\Lambda$.

For the next sections, for the sake of simplicity, we attain ourselves to the first order correction in η. Thus, the solution (4.6) is reduced to

$$e^{-2\beta} \approx 1 - \frac{\mathcal{C}_{02}}{r} - \mathcal{C}_{01} r^2 - \eta \left(\frac{\mathcal{C}_{12}}{r} + \mathcal{C}_{11} r^2 + \frac{\mathcal{C}_{13}}{r^4} \right) \ . \tag{4.14}$$

where the explicit form of the constants are displayed in (4.8).

4.1 Horizons

Eq. (4.14) can be used to determine the horizons by solving $e^{-2\beta} = 0$ [20, 21, 23, 24]. Thus, we must solve the following perturbed algebraic equation

$$r^3 \left(r - \mathcal{C}_{02} - \mathcal{C}_{01} r^3 \right) - \eta \left(\mathcal{C}_{11} r^6 + \mathcal{C}_{12} r^3 + \mathcal{C}_{13} \right) = 0 \ , \tag{4.15}$$

where the constants $\mathcal{C}$'s are listed in (4.8). The solution can be taken as a perturbative one of the form

$$r \approx r_0 + \eta r_1 \ . \tag{4.16}$$

Substituting Eq. (4.16) in Eq. (4.15) we obtain a system of two algebraic equations. At zeroth order, already with the substitution of constants $\mathcal{C}$s, we have

$$r_0^3 - \frac{3}{\tilde{\Lambda}^2} r_0 + \frac{6GM}{\tilde{\Lambda}^2} = 0 \ , \tag{4.17}$$

and, at first order,

$$r_0^3 \left(1 + 3\mathcal{C}_{01} r_0^2 \right) r_1 - \mathcal{C}_{13} r_0^3 - \mathcal{C}_{11} r_0^6 - \mathcal{C}_{13} = 0 \ , \tag{4.18}$$

which we left with the constants $\mathcal{C}$'s for the sake of simplicity. The polynomial discriminant of the Eq. (4.17) is easily computed

$$\Delta = \frac{108}{\tilde{\Lambda}^6} \left(1 - 9 G^2 M^2 \tilde{\Lambda}^2 \right) \ , \tag{4.19}$$

which is important to determine the nature of the roots of Eq. (4.17). If, and only if $\Delta > 0$, Eq. (4.17) has three real roots. Such condition implies that $3GM\tilde{\Lambda} < 1$, since $\tilde{\Lambda}$, G and M are positive quantities. By applying the trigonometric method to find all the roots of Eq. (4.17), it is found only two different positive roots, namely,

$$\begin{aligned} r_{01} &= \frac{1}{\tilde{\Lambda}} \left(c_\xi + \sqrt{3} s_\xi \right) \ , \\ r_{02} &= \frac{1}{\tilde{\Lambda}} \left(c_\xi - \sqrt{3} s_\xi \right) \ , \end{aligned} \tag{4.20}$$

where $c_\xi \equiv \cos\xi$, $s_\xi \equiv \sin\xi$ and $\xi = 1/3 \arccos\left(3GM\tilde{\Lambda} \right)$. The third root is $r_{03} = -\left(r_{01} + r_{02} \right)$, which is essentially negative and it is not physical. Since $0 < 3GM\tilde{\Lambda} < 1 \ \Rightarrow \ 0 < \arccos\left(3GM\tilde{\Lambda} \right) <$

[7] Named after the discovery of the sequence of natural numbers by the Belgian mathematician Eugène C. Catalan $(1814 - 1894)$, which made several contributions to combinatorial mathematics [22].

$\pi/2$ we have $r_{01} > r_{02} > 0$. Accordingly, r_{01} stands for the cosmological horizon and r_{02} stands for the mass distribution event horizon.

Now, the substitution of Eq. (4.20) in Eq. (4.18) provides

$$r_{1\ell} = \frac{1}{3\left(1-\frac{\tilde{\Lambda}^2}{3}r_{0\ell}^2\right)}\left(-\frac{6G^2M^2}{\tilde{\Lambda}^2}\frac{1}{r_{0\ell}^3} + \mathcal{C}_{12} + \frac{\tilde{\Lambda}^2}{3}r_{0\ell}^3\right) , \tag{4.21}$$

with $\ell = 1$ or $\ell = 2$. Hence, the form of the horizons at first order are[8]

$$\begin{aligned} r_b &= \frac{1}{\tilde{\Lambda}}\left\{\left(c_\xi - \sqrt{3}s_\xi\right) + \eta\frac{\sec(3\xi)}{6}\left[-\frac{18G^2M^2\tilde{\Lambda}^2}{\left(c_\xi - \sqrt{3}s_\xi\right)^2} + 3\mathcal{C}_{12}\left(c_\xi - \sqrt{3}s_\xi\right) + \left(c_\xi - \sqrt{3}s_\xi\right)^4\right]\right\} , \\ r_c &= \frac{1}{\tilde{\Lambda}}\left\{\left(c_\xi + \sqrt{3}s_\xi\right) + \eta\frac{\sec(3\xi)}{6}\left[-\frac{18G^2M^2\tilde{\Lambda}^2}{\left(c_\xi + \sqrt{3}s_\xi\right)^2} + 3\mathcal{C}_{12}\left(c_\xi + \sqrt{3}s_\xi\right) + \left(c_\xi + \sqrt{3}s_\xi\right)^4\right]\right\} , \end{aligned} \tag{4.22}$$

where r_b is the event horizon and r_c is the cosmological one. It is obvious that the limit $\eta \to 0$ recovers the two horizons for a Schwarzschild-de Sitter spacetime. The behavior of r_b and r_c are qualitatively displayed[9] in Figure 1 and Figure 2, respectively. We observe that the increasing of M implies on the increasing of r_b, as expected. On the other hand, r_c decreases as M increases.



Figure 1 Event horizon related to the mass spherical distribution. $r_b(x(M))$ is in units of $\tilde{\Lambda}^{-1}$ and $3GM\tilde{\Lambda} \equiv x$. The dashed curve represents the event horizon behavior of a standard black hole and the thick curve represents the perturbative horizon. For the thick curve we adopted $\eta = 10^{-1}$.

[8]We point out that the horizons depend on the integration constant C_{12}, which may depend explicitly on the mass M. The qualitative/quantitative behaviour of such horizons and the respective thermodynamical quantities is directly bounded by C_{12}. In the next steps we are assuming that C_{12} has a linear dependence on M, so all graphs in this paper are plotted under this assumption. This is a natural hypothesis since C_{12} appear as a factor of the pure Schwarzschild term correction $\sim 1/r$. Nevertheless, it may be ajusted by employing more sophisticated boundary conditions. A complete analysis of this fine tuning is left for future investigation [25].

[9]The η parameter, according to [18, 16] is very small, providing no actual difference in the plots. For this reason we overestimate η for the sake of comparison. The same observation holds for all the plots in this work.



Figure 2 Cosmological horizon. $r_c(x(M))$ is in units of $\tilde{\Lambda}^{-1}$, $3GM\tilde{\Lambda} \equiv x$ and $\eta = 10^{-1}$. The dashed curve represents the cosmological horizon obtained from the Schwarzschild-de Sitter geometry. The thick curve is the cosmological horizon with the correction from the quadratic term contribution.

4.2 Singularities

It is a straightforward calculation to find the possible singularities in the perturbative solution (4.14) by computing the Kretschmann invariant, the scalar curvature and the Ricci tensor squared, namely,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{R}^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}\mathcal{R}_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} &= \frac{48G^2M^2}{r^6} + \frac{8\tilde{\Lambda}^4}{3} + \eta\left[\left(4G^2M^2 + \frac{24G^3M^3}{\tilde{\Lambda}^2}\right)\frac{12}{r^6} + \frac{1440G^3M^3}{\tilde{\Lambda}^2 r^9} + \frac{16\tilde{\Lambda}^2}{r^6}\right] , \\
\mathcal{R} &= 4\tilde{\Lambda}^2 + \eta\left(4\tilde{\Lambda}^2 + \frac{36G^2M^2}{\tilde{\Lambda}^2 r^6}\right) , \\
\mathcal{R}^{\alpha\beta}\mathcal{R}_{\alpha\beta} &= 4\tilde{\Lambda}^4 + \eta\left(\frac{72G^2M^2}{r^6} + 8\tilde{\Lambda}^4\right) . \qquad (4.23)
\end{aligned}$$

It is then clear that a physical singularity exists at $r = 0$, as expected. Interestingly, the perturbative contributions to $\mathcal{R}$ and $\mathcal{R}^{\alpha\beta}\mathcal{R}_{\alpha\beta}$ are singular, while their zeroth order terms are not,

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{r\to 0}\mathcal{R} &\to \eta\infty \\
\lim_{r\to 0}\mathcal{R}^{\alpha\beta}\mathcal{R}_{\alpha\beta} &\to \eta\infty . \qquad (4.24)
\end{aligned}$$

The physical singularity expressed by (4.23) and (4.24) are in agreement with the standard results obtained in the Einsteinian gravity.

5 Some thermodynamical aspects

In order to improve our analysis for the solutions found so far, we will express the main thermodynamical quantities related to the horizons. For this goal, we need to compute the surface gravities defined through[10] [20]

$$\kappa_b = -\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dr}u(r)\Big|_{r=r_b} , \tag{5.1}$$

$$\kappa_c = \frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dr}u(r)\Big|_{r=r_c} , \tag{5.2}$$

where $f(r) \equiv e^{-2\beta}$. This quantity is directly related to the Hawking temperature,

$$T = \frac{\kappa}{2\pi} , \tag{5.3}$$

The second law of the thermodynamics of black holes states that the area of the surface of the event horizon can not decrease under any physical process [24]. Such entropy is calculated by

$$S = \frac{A}{4G} \equiv \frac{\pi r^2}{G} , \tag{5.4}$$

where r is the horizon radius and A is the area of this surface. In this section, the aim is to compare our results with those from the standard literature on black holes and cosmological horizons [19, 24].

The exact solution brings the similar results for the entropy to the de Sitter spacetime with a simple shift from $\tilde{\Lambda}^2$ to Υ. In the region $r \gg 2GM$, it is remarkable that we connect both perturbative and exact entropies up to corrections in η. Of course, in the limit $\eta \to 0$, both entropies are matched.

5.1 Surface gravities and entropies of the perturbative solutions

We calculate the surface gravities related to each horizon and we analyze their behaviors under the change of the mass M. In the perturbative case we have two horizons, r_b and r_c, which are explicitly written in (4.22). Let us start the analysis with the event horizon. From Eq. (5.1) we find

$$\kappa_b \approx -\frac{1}{3}\tilde{\Lambda}^2 r_{02} + \frac{2GM}{r_{02}^2} + \eta\left[-2GM\frac{r_{12}}{r_{02}^3} - \frac{1}{3}\tilde{\Lambda}^2 r_{12} + \frac{GM}{r_{02}^2} - \frac{1}{3}\tilde{\Lambda}^2 r_{02} - \frac{12G^2M^2}{\tilde{\Lambda}^2}\frac{1}{r_{02}^5}\right] . \tag{5.5}$$

The behavior of κ_b are qualitatively displayed in Figure 3. We observe that the increasing of M implies on the decreasing of κ_b. Accordingly, from Eq. (5.3), it is clear that the temperature $T_b = \kappa_b/2\pi$ has the same behavior as κ_b.

For the cosmological horizon, Eq. (5.2) provides

$$\kappa_c \approx \frac{1}{3}\tilde{\Lambda}^2 r_{01} - \frac{2GM}{r_{01}^2} + \eta\left[2GM\frac{r_{11}}{r_{01}^3} + \frac{1}{3}\tilde{\Lambda}^2 r_{11} - \frac{GM}{r_{01}^2} + \frac{1}{3}\tilde{\Lambda}^2 r_{01} + \frac{12G^2M^2}{\tilde{\Lambda}^2}\frac{1}{r_{01}^5}\right] . \tag{5.6}$$

The plot of the cosmological horizon surface gravity, as function of M, is displayed in Figure 4. The behavior of the surface gravity is essentially the same in both cases. According to Eq. (5.3), the respective temperature $T_c = \kappa_c/2\pi$ have the same qualitative behavior as the cosmological horizon.

[10] Since the Killing field is just r-dependent, we can use this simplified expressions rather than the general formula $\zeta^a \nabla_a \zeta^b = \kappa \zeta^b$, where ζ^a is the Killing vector field normal to the horizon.



Figure 3 Surface gravity in the event horizon of the mass spherical distribution M. The dashed and thick curves stand for the standard surface gravity of a black hole and the perturbative surface gravity, respectively. For the thick curve we adopted $\eta = 10^{-3}$.



Figure 4 Surface gravity of the cosmological horizon. $r_c(x(M))$ is in units of $\tilde{\Lambda}^{-1}$, $3GM\tilde{\Lambda} \equiv x$ and $\eta = 10^{-2}$. The dashed curve represents the surface gravity to the cosmological horizon obtained from the Schwarzschild-de Sitter geometry. The thick curve is the cosmological horizon with the correction from the quadratic term contribution.

The entropies can be computed from Eq. (5.4), providing[11]

$$S_b = \frac{\pi r_b^2}{G} \approx \frac{\pi r_{01}^2}{G}\left[1 + 2\eta\left(\frac{r_{11}}{r_{01}}\right)^2\right] , \tag{5.7}$$

$$S_c = \frac{\pi r_c^2}{G} \approx \frac{\pi r_{02}^2}{G}\left[1 + 2\eta\left(\frac{r_{12}}{r_{02}}\right)^2\right] , \tag{5.8}$$

where r_{11} and r_{12} correspond to the corrections due to the quadratic curvature term of the horizons. It is clear from the plots that S_b increases with the mass while S_c decreases with the mass. We remark that entropy behaviors are in agreement with [19, 26], of course, with a small deviation

[11] We will not display the full expressions to the entropies (5.7) and (5.8) due to their extension.

due the perturbative approximation. The plots with the qualitative behavior of such entropies are displayed in Figure 5 and Figure 6.



Figure 5 Entropy of the event horizon of the mass spherical distribution. $S_b(x(M))$ is in units of $\tilde{\Lambda}^{-1}$, $3GM\tilde{\Lambda} \equiv x$ and $\eta = 10^{-2}$. The dashed curve represents the entropy to the standard black hole horizon obtained from the Schwarzschild-de Sitter geometry. The thick curve is the entropy with the correction from the quadratic term contribution.



Figure 6 Entropy of the cosmological horizon. $S_c(x(M))$ is in units of $\tilde{\Lambda}^{-1}$, $3GM\tilde{\Lambda} \equiv x$ and $\eta = 10^{-1}$. The dashed curve represents the entropy to the standard cosmological horizon obtained from the Schwarzschild-de Sitter geometry. The thick curve is the entropy with the correction from the quadratic term contribution.

6 Conclusions

In this work we found static spherically symmetric solutions to a generalized gravity action in the EC formalism for vanishing torsion situations. The model, described by the action (2.1), is composed by the usual EH term, the cosmological constant term, a curvature squared term, and a quadratic torsion term. Our results are summarized here:

- The coupled system of differential equations (2.7)-(2.10) is exactly solved. The result is a de Sitter spacetime described by (3.7) with two possible effective cosmological constants described

in (3.6). Both cases are compositions of the parameters $\tilde{\Lambda}$ and Λ. This result is important since the system (2.7)-(2.10) is over-determined.

- For the case where $\tilde{\Lambda} \ll \Lambda$, the effective cosmological constants are simplified (at first order) to Eq. (3.8). Hence, two regimes are possible, one with a strong curvature and another with a weak curvature.

- By treating the the quadratic curvature term as a perturbation when compared do the rest of the terms, a perturbative solution is found. For that, Eq. (2.10) can be neglected (this situation corresponds to the case where torsion is set to zero at the action level). Hence, the smaller system system (2.7)-(2.9) is not over-determined. The solution (4.6) is a deformation of the usual Schwarzschild-de Sitter solution.

- The appropriate limits of the perturbative solution are all consistent. In particular, at the limit $r \to \infty$, the asymptotic spacetime is a de Sitter spacetime. The same spacetime is obtained from the exact solution for $\tilde{\Lambda} \ll \Lambda$. See (4.10)-(4.12).

- The usual singularity $r = 0$ is present at the perturbative solution and no other singularities appear.

- The horizons are obtained as perturbed deformations of the usual event and cosmological horizons of the Schwarzschild-de Sitter spacetime, namely (4.22).

- Moreover, the surface gravities and entropies associated to the horizons are also computed. The results are perturbations around the usual surface gravities and entropies of the Schwarzschild-de Sitter spacetime. See (5.5)-(5.8).

- It is also discussed the qualitative behavior of the horizons, surface gravities and entropies as functions of the mass M of the matter distribution. In all cases, the bigger the mass the better is the agreement between the perturbative solution and the Schwarzschild-de Sitter one. The deviations, *i.e.*, the perturbative corrections, are stronger as the mass decreases.

At this point it is convenient to compare our perturbative solution (4.6) with the one encountered by K. S. Stelle in [9]. In that work, a general theory of gravity in the second order formalism with higher derivative terms (quadratic terms in the Riemman tensor, Ricci tensor and scalar curvature) is considered. A perturbative static and spherically symmetric solution is found. At first sight one could argue that our result should be just a particular case of Stelle's result for a suitable choice of parameters. However, our result is strongly different. First of all, the result in [9] is a perturbation around Minkowski spacetime. Their field equations are not perturbed equations as ours. As a consequence, their perturbed functions are different from ours. In fact, our perturbations consist on corrections of the Schwarzschild-de Sitter solution due to the quadratic curvature term while the solution in [9] is a perturbation around the Minkowski spacetime, independently of the magnitude of the higher order derivative terms. Hence, to our knowledge, our results are genuine novel solutions. Moreover, it is known that the field equations in the second order formalism are significantly different from the equations obtained in the first order formalism [27, 28, 29], except for the special case of GR.

The study of static spherically symmetric solutions within action (2.1) inside the matter distribution is currently under investigation for a perfect fluid distribution [25]. Moreover, solutions for spherically symmetric matter distributions in the presence of electromagnetic fields and rotation will be analyzed as well.

Finally, let us remark that the generalization of our results by considering non-vanishing torsion will also be studied. In this case, the system (2.2)-(2.3) have more degrees of freedom, a property that opens possibility of new solutions than the ones here found.

Acknowledgments

The Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (CNPq-Brazil), The Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior (CAPES), the Pró-Reitoria de Pesquisa, Pós-Graduação e Inovação (PROPPI-UFF) and Centro Brasileiro de Pesquisas Físicas are acknowledge for financial support.

References

[1] Albert Einstein. The Foundation of the General Theory of Relativity. *Annalen Phys.*, 49:769–822, 1916. [Annalen Phys.14,517(2005)].

[2] Ryoyu Utiyama. Invariant theoretical interpretation of interaction. *Phys. Rev.*, 101:1597–1607, Mar. 1956.

[3] T. W. B. Kibble. Lorentz invariance and the gravitational field. *J. Math. Phys.*, 2:212–221, 1961.

[4] Dennis W. Sciama. The Physical Structure of General Relativity. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 36:463–469, Jan. 1964.

[5] Jorge Zanelli. Lecture notes on Chern-Simons (super-)gravities. Second edition (February 2008). In *Proceedings, 7th Mexican Workshop on Particles and Fields (MWPF 1999)*, 2005.

[6] P. G. Bergmann and V. De Sabbata. Cosmology and Gravitation. Spin, Torsion, Rotation, and Supergravity. Proceedings, Nato Advanced Study Institute, Erice, Italy, May 6-18, 1979. *NATO Sci. Ser. B*, 58:pp.1–510, 1980.

[7] M. Ferraris, M. Francaviglia, and C. Reina. Variational formulation of general relativity from 1915 to 1925 "palatini's method" discovered by einstein in 1925. *General Relativity and Gravitation*, 14(3):243–254, 1982.

[8] V. De Sabbata and M. Gasperini. *Introduction to Gravitation*. World Scientific, 1986.

[9] K. S. Stelle. Classical Gravity with Higher Derivatives. *Gen. Rel. Grav.*, 9:353–371, 1978.

[10] Michael D. Seifert. Stability of spherically symmetric solutions in modified theories of gravity. *Phys. Rev.*, D76:064002, 2007.

[11] Lorenzo Sebastiani and Sergio Zerbini. Static Spherically Symmetric Solutions in F(R) Gravity. *Eur. Phys. J.*, C71:1591, 2011.

[12] H. L, A. Perkins, C. N. Pope, and K. S. Stelle. Spherically Symmetric Solutions in Higher-Derivative Gravity. *Phys. Rev.*, D92(12):124019, 2015.

[13] R. F. Sobreiro, A. A. Tomaz, and V. J. Vasquez Otoya. de Sitter gauge theories and induced gravities. *Eur. Phys. Jour. C*, 72:1991, 2012.

[14] R. F. Sobreiro, A. A. Tomaz, and V. J. Vasquez Otoya. Gauge theories and gravity. *PoS*, ICMP2012:019, 2012.

[15] R. F. Sobreiro and V. J. Vasquez Otoya. Affine gauge theory of gravity and its reduction to the Riemann-Cartan geometry. *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.*, 283:012032, 2011.

[16] Rodrigo F. Sobreiro and Anderson A. Tomaz. Predicting Planck Scale and Newtonian Constant from a Yang-Mills Gauge Theory: 1- and 2-Loop Estimates. *Adv. High Energy Phys.*, 2016:9048263, 2016.

[17] B. P. Abbott et al. Observation of Gravitational Waves from a Binary Black Hole Merger. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 116(6):061102, 2016.

[18] T. S. Assimos, A. D. Pereira, T. R. S. Santos, R. F. Sobreiro, A. A. Tomaz, and V. J. Vasquez Otoya. Dark gravity from a renormalizable gauge theory. *To appear in the International Journal of Modern Physics*, 2013.

[19] G. W. Gibbons and S. W. Hawking. Cosmological Event Horizons, Thermodynamics, and Particle Creation. *Phys. Rev.*, D15:2738–2751, 1977.

[20] Vitor Cardoso and Jose P. S. Lemos. Quasinormal modes of the near extremal Schwarzschild-de Sitter black hole. *Phys. Rev.*, D67:084020, 2003.

[21] Valerio Faraoni. Cosmological and Black Hole Apparent Horizons. *Lect. Notes Phys.*, 907:pp.1–199, 2015.

[22] Richard Stanley and Eric W. Weisstein. Catalan Numbers – From MathWorld – A Wolfram Web Resource.

[23] Sourav Bhattacharya and Amitabha Lahiri. On the existence of cosmological event horizon. *Class. Quant. Grav.*, 27:165015, 2010.

[24] Robert M. Wald. *General Relativity*. 1984.

[25] F. A. Silveira, R. F. Sobreiro, and A. A. Tomaz. Work in Progress.

[26] V. P. Frolov and G. A. Vilkovisky. Spherically Symmetric Collapse in Quantum Gravity. *Phys. Lett.*, B106:307–313, 1981.

[27] Q. Exirifard and M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari. Lovelock gravity at the crossroads of Palatini and metric formulations. *Phys. Lett.*, B661:158–161, 2008.

[28] Monica Borunda, Bert Janssen, and Mar Bastero-Gil. Palatini versus metric formulation in higher curvature gravity. *JCAP*, 0811:008, 2008.

[29] Salvatore Capozziello, Farhad Darabi, and Daniele Vernieri. Equivalence between Palatini and metric formalisms of f(R)-gravity by divergence free current. *Mod. Phys. Lett.*, A26:65–72, 2011.